



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/799,556	03/11/2004	Michael H. Zimmerman	128346-60601	7793

7590 06/01/2007
James M. Singer
Pepper Hamilton LLP
One Mellon Center, 50th Floor
500 Grant Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

EXAMINER

FRIDIE JR, WILLMON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3722	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/799,556

Applicant(s)

ZIMMERMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Willmon Fridie

Art Unit

3722

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Murray et al.

In regard to claims 8,9,15 and 16, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed materials, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

In regard to claims 7 and 17, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed range, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art,

Art Unit: 3722

discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233.

In regard to claim 18 and 19, the choice of tools would have been an obvious matter of design choice to a skilled artisan depending on the desired use of the assembly.

Claims 1-6, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fladgard et al. in view of Murray et al.

Fladgard et al. discloses the method as set forth and as broadly presented except for an insert with superabrasive material thereon. Murray et al. teaches the use of superabrasive material on a cutting tool. It would have been obvious to a skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to provide the cutting insert of Fladgard et al (34) with a super abrasive coating as taught by Skeem et al in order to improve the cutting efficiency of the tool.

In regard to claims 2-4 and 23, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the claimed materials, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416.

In regard to claims 5 and 6, the orientation and movement of the work and tool relative to each other would have been an obvious matter of design choice, since these particular arrangements are old and well known.

Response to Arguments

Art Unit: 3722

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner has failed to adequately describe the disclosure of the cited reference(s) and the relevant features pertinent to applicant's claims, the examiner would like to direct applicant's attention to 37 CFR 1.104 which states:

Completeness of examiner's action...

(c) Rejection of claims .

(1) If the invention is not considered patentable, or not considered patentable as claimed, the claims, or those considered unpatentable will be rejected.

(2) In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

Hence, in the present case it is clear that the cited reference(s) is neither complicated nor complex, does not describe an invention dissimilar to applicant's and the pertinent features relied upon by the examiner in the rejection are readily apparent to one skilled in the art.

Further with respect to applicant's arguments concerning the Murray reference, it has been held that a recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. *Ex parte Masham*, 2 USPQ 1647 (1987).

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., the limitations discussed in the last paragraph on page 8 of applicant's response)

Art Unit: 3722

are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

To the extent that the examiner does not respond to a particular argument/comment in the applicant's remarks section with respect to the rejection of claims 1-6,22 and 23, the examiner does not intend by this to indicate acquiescence in or agreement with the argument/comment. Further it appears the main argument presented is directed to the relevance of the Murray reference. Fladgard et al. is deemed to be relevant and analogous to the claims as broadly presented . Fladgard et al states:

Although specific embodiments of the invention have been described above for purposes of illustration and enablement, various modifications may be made to the embodiments and features described herein without deviating from the spirit and scope of the invention because the foregoing is not intended to be exhaustive or to limit the invention. For example, other types of support members may be used to support FCS workpieces above the second blade. Additionally, other embodiments may not have a first blade 34 that penetrates the workpiece 90, but rather a cutting tool can have an elongated driver that directly engages the workpiece to drive the second side 92 against the second blade 44. Aspects of the invention can also be applied to other materials, such as ceramics, cements or composites. Moreover, features of the foregoing embodiments can be combined with other features and aspects of cutting cement materials, such as forming non-linear cuts in fiber-cement siding... Accordingly, the invention is not limited except as set forth in the appended claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Willmon Fridle whose telephone number is 571 272 4476. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MONICA CARTER can be reached on 571 272 4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

wf


WILMON FRIDIE, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER